

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 93 04:30:16 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #394  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 26 Oct 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    394

Today's Topics:

Inflation  
SSB Intruders on HF

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: 26 Oct 93 08:53:53 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!  
unlinfo.unl.edu!mcduffie@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Inflation  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Don't sweat it, Ed. If you have to wear a tie to go, it ain't worth  
goin'. Nuff Sed!

Gary

-----  
Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1993 19:47:26 GMT  
From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!avatar!sorgatz@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: SSB Intruders on HF  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gchristianson-211093154422@mac\_072.pppl.gov> gchristianson@pppl.gov  
(George B. Christianson) writes:  
>In article <drew.66.0@trl.oz.au>, drew@trl.oz.au (D.Diamond) wrote:

>>  
>> Forget the blasted code debate. There will be no HF bands if we don't  
>> act, and do something pretty soon. Don't you guys in the 'States hear that  
>> wall-to-wall waffle on our precious HF bands? 7MHz is full of it, 10.1MHz is  
>> jumping with it- thousands of SSB CB type signals. What's going on? I still  
>> have not been able to identify the language (Indonesian? and Spanish too).  
>> Is it only plainly audible this side of the Pacific?

>>  
>> What can we do about it? And please be sensible- no time-wasting smart-arse  
>> (ass) replies, this is serious.

>>  
>> 73, Drew, VK3XU.

>  
> Yes, here in New Jersey every evening the 10.1 MHz band, which to the  
>best of my knowledge has NO legal amateur SSB operation, is lousy with  
>strong SSB signals chattering away in Spanish. I can understand enough  
>Spanish to tell that these are NOT licensed amateurs, and are located in  
>Central and South America. I can sometimes hear these clowns transmitting  
>right on top of WWV on 10 MHz. Also, they appear to be encroaching on 14  
>MHz, starting up from the bottom. When the sunspot cycle was higher, the  
>lower 100 or 200 kHz of the 28 MHz band was loaded with the "hola, hola  
>banda libre" crowd. These are pirate operators in countries whose  
>governments obviously do not care about criminal radio operation by their  
>citizens. My suspicion is that the reason the ARRL and IARU never have  
>anything to say about this issue is that there really is no solution.  
>Washington cannot even obtain cooperation from some of these governments on  
>drug trafficking or illegal immigration, and I'm sure that keeping pirate  
>operators out of amateur radio bands would be a LOW priority request. The  
>most useful suggestion I've seen would be for us to move to CLOVER or some  
>other robust mode of communication. What other solutions are there?  
>Home-on-SSB missiles? Infiltration of the Peace Corp ranks by ham agents  
>armed with DF equipment and grenades?

>  
>

73, George  
NJ2P

>

Oh jeez! Now you've done it! Watch out George...the net.ham-radio.politically-  
correct  
crowd is gonna SWOOP down on you like an angry hornet swarm! I know, they did it  
to  
me when I complained about the bootleggers on 10m. It appears you can complain but  
only  
if you never mention: spanish, hispanic, mexicans, mexico, South America, Central  
Amer.

'hola!', XE0's, the FCC, the ARRL or anything that might tend to somehow signify that you're damn sick and tired of these idiots ruining the band(s), and/or that the POWERS ought to do their assigned job of lobbying or enforcement.

The pc crowd will call you a nazi, a bigot, a racist and a lot of other words that havenothing whatever to do with the fact that the bootleggers are breaking the law and need to be caught and punished...but then the pc crowd is composed of a lot of DWEEBS that seem to listen to everything BUT the HF bands...

73 George...and while you're at it, why not send a copy of your observations to your ARRL rep? Or perhaps to K1ZZ? I advise everyone interested in stopping the wholesale SLAUGHTER of the entire HF spectrum to do likewise.

-Avatar-> (aka: Erik K. Sorgatz) KB6LUY +-----+  
TTI(es@soldev.tti.com)or: sorgatz@avatar.tti.com \*Government produces NOTHING!\*  
3100 Ocean Park Blvd. Santa Monica, CA 90405 +-----+  
(OPINIONS EXPRESSED DO NOT REFLECT THE VIEWS OF CITICORP OR ITS MANAGEMENT!)

-----  
Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1993 22:04:58 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931024.45875.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CFFCJB.Hws@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<19930ct25.122832.6048@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: DON"T End It All Now, Please ...

In article <19930ct25.122832.6048@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CFFCJB.Hws@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>>

>>1: The point I was trying to make Ed, is what makes amateur radio distinct  
>>from 11 meters? We have to pass exams based on rules, regulations, and  
>>technical matters; and we have a skill test: code. Nothing is required to  
>>operate on 11 meters. Now, we know the written exams alone are not much  
>>of a challenge, so it must be the code skill which seperates us from

>>them. If the code requirement is deleted, then we MUST replace it  
>>with something more challenging than the current written exams. I would  
>>love to see essay-type exams given, having one sketch some fundamental  
>>circuits and block diagrams, and requiring an explanation of the  
>>various parameters of the circuits and diagrams.  
>  
>Must we? I think you're wrong that it's an exam that separates amateurs  
>from CBers in terms of operating manners. I think it's mostly peer group  
>pressure that keeps the amateur bands a touch more civilized than the  
>CB band, not an exam. CB is an anonymous anarchy where people can act  
>out their most bizarre fantasies free of censure while hiding behind  
>"handles". Amateur radio is marked foremost by the fact that everyone  
>IDs frequently, perhaps too frequently on occasion, and insist that everyone  
>they contact do so as well. They even hunt down offenders. This is the  
>real difference between the two services.  
>  
>It should be noted that the commercial users of spectrum, and GMRS users,  
>also ID, and they behave in a civilized fashion without the necessity of  
>an exam of any sort. It's not the exam, it's the license, and the need to  
>identify themselves, that makes the difference. I don't have any objection  
>to more challenging technical exams in a service where the user is allowed  
>to build his own equipment, but I don't think it's the exam that makes  
>the difference in operating manners.  
>  
>Gary  
>--

But Gary, let's look at the type of person who goes the ham radio route rather than into CB: (s)he must be someone with a bit of self-discipline to study the rules, regulations, operating procedures, theory, and possibly code (depending upon the license desired). So it is the exams (which dictates the type of person attracted to the hobby) which separates the two services. Of course, what you've shared, the necessity of identification, and peer pressure is VERY true, and combined with the required course of study for an exam provides a definite delineation between the two hobbies.

Now, hopefully Derek 'the astrologer' is still asleep from gazing into the sky all night long, and won't catch any spellin airs [sick].

Jeff NH6IL (back when ... ummm ... : WA6QIJ)

-----

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1993 22:30:24 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931024.45875.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <CFFCJB.Hws@news.Hawaii.Edu>,

<rcrw90-251093105138@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>  
Subject : Re: DON'T End It All Now, Please ...

In article <rcrw90-251093105138@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com> rcrw90@email.mot.com  
(Mike Waters) writes:

>In article <CFFCJB.Hws@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu  
>(Jeff Herman) wrote:

>

>> In article <931024.45875.EDELLERS@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com>  
writes:

>> >1: Exactly how does the code requirement keep the amateur HF bands from  
>> >sounding like 11 meters? It doesn't even keep 14.313 from sounding like  
>> >14.313!

>

>> We have to pass exams based on rules, regulations, and  
>> technical matters; and we have a skill test: code. Nothing is required to  
>> operate on 11 meters. Now, we know the written exams alone are not much  
>> of a challenge, so it must be the code skill which seperates us from  
>> them. If the code requirement is deleted, then we MUST replace it  
>> with something more challenging than the current written exams.

>

>That hardly supports you initial assertion. You argue for good tests, not  
>a CW test! As far as I am aware, there is \*zero\* movement to remove or  
>reduce the written exam and quite a lot of effort going into improving the  
>question pool. There is no evidence BTW that the current multiuple choice  
>format is any "easier" than essay type (or orals as I had in 1961!), it is  
>just much easier to administer.

>

>--

But Mike, it is the code exam that is the major challenge, not the written  
exams. I added if the code requirement is ever deleted, THEN we had better  
replace it with something to fill the void, such as beefed up written exams.  
And you can't be serious with what you stated in your last sentence! Just by  
guessing someone could pass a multiple choice exam; try 'guessing' on an  
essay-type test.

[shhh, nobody wake Derek up]

Jeff NH6IL (back when the cold stare of the FCC examiner would make  
one's heart stop: WA6QIJ)

-----

Date: 26 Oct 93 05:42:04 GMT  
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gregCFBxt9.8vv@netcom.com>,  
<1993Oct23.163604.28866@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,  
<rcrw90-251093103704@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>  
Reply-To : rcanders@nyx.UUCP (Mr. Nice Guy)  
Subject : Re: GAY & QST

In article <rcrw90-251093103704@node\_142cf.aieg.mot.com>  
rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:  
>In article <1993Oct23.163604.28866@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,  
>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) wrote:  
>  
>> The ARRL is a membership organization. Why should the board go against  
>> the will of large percentage of its members ?  
>  
>I wonder how you speak for the "majority of ARRL members"?  
>  
>You must have missed the news, but discrimination is neither the law of the  
>land any more nor is it very popular

In general a publisher can refuse advertising for many reasons. It is  
legal to discriminate against cigarette companies, auto companies,  
brewers, and "unsuitable" organizations if the publisher decides they  
are not suitable for the publication.

Even political speech is not protected. There are several  
publications that have refused National Rifle Association ads.

Discrimination is legal in many cases and is natural. If you are  
having a party and decide not to invite people who get drunk and start  
fights you are discriminating against them. If you want to start a  
private gay club and exclude the "Christian Right" you can do so. This  
is known as the freedom of association.

If you don't like your teenaged son running around with a group that  
drinks and smokes you are discriminating against drinkers and smokers.  
Isn't it reasonable for some people not to want to associate with gays  
because they consider their behavior immoral ?

>  
>> There are several times more  
>> members who believe that homos are depraved and immoral than there are  
>> gays in the organization.  
>  
>Have you taken a survey?  
>

If Wayne (B.S.) Green is to be believed most of the hams have one foot in the grave because of old age. Many of the ARRL members are old timers.

If you are over 45 years you learned that gay sex is something that one does not do ! Queers are immoral and filthy people. This is the way people were brought up fifty years ago. Certain things were not done by good people. Few of these people are going to change their minds.

Some members would consider it their duty to quit the ARRL if they thought that it supported and promoted queers.

>The issue is not how many gay/lesbian members exist, but whether ARRL  
>should try to enforce your "morality" despite the law. A lot more people  
>than just gays and lesbians support fair and non-discriminatory treatment  
>for these people.  
>

Support the law! Is this law any more just than a law forbidding gay sex because it spreads AIDS ? Is the law even constitutional ? Didn't the ARRL later agree to carry the AIDS. Aren't the gays trying to get even with the ARRL ?

I am not anti-gay, but I do object to the claim that for the gays to enjoy their "rights" the government must use its power to prevent me from discriminate against them. In their mind my freedom not to associate is discrimination.

--

Rod Anderson	"I do not think the United States government
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu	is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
	fanatics decided to kill themselves"
Clinton, Gore, gone in four	Slick Willie the Compassionate

-----

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1993 01:03:40 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <gregCFBxt9.8vv@netcom.com>,  
<1993Oct23.163604.28866@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <CFGyA3.KsL@ucdavis.edu>  
Subject : Re: GAY & QST

In article <CFGyA3.KsL@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)

writes:

>Mr. Nice Guy (rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu) wrote:

>: The ARRL is a membership organization. Why should the board go against  
>: the will of large percentage of its members ? The are several times more  
>: members who believe that homos are depraved and immoral than their are  
>: gays in the organization.

>

>Gee Rod lets see if I have this right, a majority of the ARRL members  
>think that the ARRL should do something illegal and this obliges the ARRL  
>to commit this illegal act?

Speaking of illegal, isn't sodomy still illegal in many states? I've asked  
this before: why should the ARRL be forced to advertise nationally a  
group that condones an act that is illegal in many of the states that the  
magazine will be sold?

And how did this subject sneak into .policy from .misc (unless this news-  
group also covers ARRL policy...).

Jeff NH6IL

-----

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 1993 20:01:13 GMT

From: tcsi.tcs.com!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!

ez006683@uunet.uu.net

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2a660b\$97g@reznor.larc.nasa.gov>, <gregCFBxt9.8vv@netcom.com>,  
<1993Oct23.163604.28866@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>

Subject : Re: GAY & QST

Mr. Nice Guy (rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: The ARRL is a membership organization. Why should the board go against  
: the will of large percentage of its members ? The are several times more  
: members who believe that homos are depraved and immoral than their are  
: gays in the organization.

Gee Rod lets see if I have this right, a majority of the ARRL members  
think that the ARRL should do something illegal and this obliges the ARRL  
to commit this illegal act? No I am not saying that that thinking "homos  
are depraved and immoral" is or should be illegal. What I am saying is  
the resultant policies may be illegal or actions carried out in  
accordance with such policies might be illegal. The ARRL board is not  
required to act on every whim of the membership. in fact I know that in  
California the individual Board members can be held legally liable if they  
do not carry out their duties prudently, regardless of the wishes of the  
membership.



Not a Lawyer, not on TV or anywhere.

Dan

```
--
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #394

\*\*\*\*\*